

ARTICLE 8
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

1
2
3
4 8.1 Policy. Performance evaluations are used to assess, recognize, and facilitate improvement
5 in Employees' performance. This strengthens the University's workforce by providing a
6 periodic and formal exchange of information between supervisors and employees
7 regarding progress, accomplishments, and when applicable, areas needing improvement.
8 Performance evaluations also provide an opportunity to clarify work standards, discuss
9 training and development needs, set goals for the next year, and identify the support
10 needed to reach such goals.

11
12 8.2 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation.

13
14 A. Purpose. Annual evaluations for faculty members focus on performance in functions
15 such as teaching, research, service, other duties that may be assigned. Annual evaluations
16 for Academic/Professionals focus on performance of all assigned duties. In addition, all
17 Employees are evaluated based on their contributions to the orderly and effective
18 functioning of the University and their academic department/unit.

19
20 B. Scope. Evaluators should endeavor to assist the Employee in correcting any
21 performance deficiencies reflected in the annual evaluation. Employees are encouraged to
22 accept and seek such assistance, if needed. The evaluation should also state goals for the
23 upcoming year and address progress toward promotion.

24
25 8.3 Annual Evaluation. Employees are evaluated at least once annually.

26
27 (a) The annual appraisal period will cover all employment occurring from February 1
28 through January 31, regardless of the employment start date. The annual evaluation
29 process will approximately follow the sample schedule below:

Date/Date Range	Activity
February 1 to January 31	Performance appraisal time period
February 1 to February 15	Employee evaluation materials completed by Employee and transmitted to their evaluator

For the University

For the UFF

Mark Bonfanti
Chief Negotiator

Candi Churchill
Chief Negotiator

Date

Date

February 16 to March 30	Evaluators complete draft evaluations and submit faculty evaluations to Panel for review
April 1 to April 7	Panel reviews faculty evaluations
April 8 to May 15	Evaluations revised if necessary, and distributed to Employees
May 15 to May 29	Evaluations discussed with employees
May 30	Evaluations submitted to HR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

(b) This process does not align with the academic semesters but provides for evaluation during the spring semester while all Employees are on campus. The evaluator must complete the appraisal, review and discuss it with the Employee (unless the Employee chooses to not discuss the appraisal), and provide a copy to the Employee prior to May 15. The Evaluator and Employee shall sign the appraisal, and the Evaluator shall submit the signed appraisal to Human Resources by May 30, and a copy of the signed appraisal shall be placed in the Employee’s personnel file.

8.4 Probationary Appraisal. In addition to the annual evaluation, Academic/Professionals shall receive a probationary appraisal after ninety (90) days of employment in their position.

- (a) In the absence of a completed probationary appraisal, a probationary employee will default to an “satisfactory” rating.
- (b) If an Academic/Professional’s probationary period ends between October 31 and January 30, the employee’s immediately following annual appraisal may be skipped. If skipped, the employee shall be evaluated during the next annual appraisal period.

8.5 Evaluators.

- (a) Faculty Evaluators are the Department Chair or Division Director that has been assigned personnel management responsibility by the Provost for the Employee’s

For the University

For the UFF

 Mark Bonfanti
 Chief Negotiator

 Candi Churchill
 Chief Negotiator

 Date

 Date

1 area. When the evaluator is a Division Director, the Division director will seek
2 advice and context from a department chair for each of the faculty members in the
3 unit. Academic/Professionals are evaluated by their immediate supervisor.

- 4
5 (b) For faculty, the Provost will appoint an evaluation review panel which will consist
6 of Evaluators, and if the Faculty Assembly chooses to do so, two faculty members
7 of senior rank (Associate Professor or Professor) appointed by the F.A. The purpose
8 of the review is to ensure the Evaluators have applied a consistent standard to all
9 faculty members when conducting the evaluations. This review may produce
10 changes in evaluations. The Provost will serve as chair of the evaluation review
11 panel. All members of the evaluation review panel must agree to the confidentiality
12 of the review process.

13
14 8.6 Contesting Evaluations.

- 15
16 (a) Faculty that wish to contest their evaluation may request a review, in writing, within
17 fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation, where the Provost, the faculty
18 member, and the evaluator will discuss the evaluation. The Provost shall make the final
19 evaluation decision.—The faculty member may at his/her election, accept the fial
20 decision of the provost, or may request a reconsideration by the evaluation panel. In
21 the event of a reevaluation by the panel, the evaluation results will be fully
22 reconsidered and the ultimate evaluation “score” may go down as well as up.
23
24 (b) Within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the evaluation,
25 Academic/Professionals may request, in writing, a meeting with the administrator at
26 the next higher level in their line of authority, to discuss concerns regarding the
27 evaluation which were not resolved in previous discussions with the evaluator. Such
28 administrator shall make the final evaluation decision.

- 29
30 8.7 Evaluation Information Sheet. A sample faculty information sheet format is attached to
31 this contract. The Faculty Assembly may provide the Provost with recommended changes
32 to the information sheet’s format no later than December 1 on an annual basis. The Provost
33 will communicate decisions on changes in the format to the Faculty Assembly by

For the University

For the UFF

Mark Bonfanti
Chief Negotiator

Candi Churchill
Chief Negotiator

Date

Date

1 January 15. See Appendix __.

2
 3 8.8 Evaluation Criteria. The administration will develop a set of evaluation guidelines for each
 4 of the faculty ranks that indicates performance characteristics appropriate to each rating for
 5 teaching, scholarship, and service. The guidelines will also indicate how an overall “rating”
 6 will be determined. This guideline will be provided to the academic departments on
 7 approximately September 15 of each year and the departments will provide comment on
 8 the guidelines on or before November 1 of each year. IN early January the review evaluation
 9 panel will consider the department recommendations and provide a recommendation to the
 10 provost on evaluation guidelines to be used for the current review cycle.

11
 12 The scale for the evaluations is provided in the following table.

13
 14 **Evaluation Key:**

Unsatisfactory	Performance that is clearly substandard. <u>Receipt of this rating indicates that further review of the individual’s performance is required and the termination may be appropriate.</u>
Needs Improvement	Performance that is below a reasonable expectation for the person’s job description. <u>Receipt of this rating is formal notice to the employee that their performance is substandard and that further action may be required.</u>
Satisfactory-	Performance is basically sound and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description. The minus indicates that an improvement in some area is strongly encouraged.
Satisfactory	Performance is basically sound and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description.
Satisfactory+	Performance is basically sound and within reasonable expectations for the person’s job description. The individual has distinguished themselves in some way within the parameters for their job description.

For the University

For the UFF

 Mark Bonfanti
 Chief Negotiator

 Candi Churchill
 Chief Negotiator

 Date

 Date

Exceeds Expectations	Performance is basically sound and within reasonable expectations for the person's job description. The individual has distinguished themselves in some way by performing at a level that is above a normal expectation for their job description.
Exemplary	Performance is basically sound and above reasonable expectations for the person's job description. The individual has truly done something that is outstanding.

1
2
3
4

8.8 Evaluation File. Faculty members shall refer to 6C13-6.008 Personnel Records and Limited-Access Records regarding access to performance evaluations.

For the University

For the UFF

Mark Bonfanti
Chief Negotiator

Candi Churchill
Chief Negotiator

Date

Date